

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

MARTIN ONASSIS GOODSON,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	No. 3:25-cv-816-K (BT)
	§	
CITY OF DALLAS, et al.	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and any objections thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the undersigned District Judge is of the opinion that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court. The plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and/or injunction (ECF No. 8) and motion for a protective order (ECF No. 6) are **DENIED**.

After filing these motions, the plaintiff filed a "Motion to Reassign Case to Article III District Judge and Objection to Magistrate Referral," in which he objects to the referral of this case to the Magistrate Judge. ECF No. 14. That motion is **DENIED**, and to the extent it could be considered an objection to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation, it is **OVERRULED**. Referrals to United States Magistrate Judges are authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 636 and are constitutional. *See, e.g., Escudero v. Jordan*, 2019

WL 4463265, at \*2 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 18, 2019) (citing *Bowman v. Bordenkircher*, 522 F.2d 209 (4th Cir. 1975); *Corbett v. United States*, 2014 WL 1783599 (S.D.W. Va. May 5, 2014)). Plaintiff has not lost any right to have an Article III Judge hear his case, as he can object to the Magistrate Judge's recommendations or orders. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

**SO ORDERED.**

Signed May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ed Kinkeade", written over a horizontal line.

ED KINKEADE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE